DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 762 HE 002 485

AUTHOR	Brock, W. E.
TITLE	Congress Looks at the Campus.
PUB DATE	24 Jun 69
NOTE	7p.; Report appeared in Congressional Record, Proceedings and Debates of the 91st Congress, First Session
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Activism, *Federal Programs, *Higher Education, *Student Attitudes, *Student College Relationship, Student Opinion
IDENTIFIERS	*Brock Report

ABSTRACT

This is a report of a campus tour led by US Representative Bill Brock of Tennessee to gain a better understanding of student unrest. The 22 participating Congressment were divided into 6 regional groups which together visited over 50 universities of all types and sizes. Their report discusses a series of issues named by students as major sources of concern or dissatisfaction. These issues include: communication channels, institutional unresponsiveness, hypocrisy, educational irrelevance, administrative over-reaction, black experience and non-white expectations, racism, the military-industrial complex, poverty and hunger, imperialism and the Third World, police state tactics, economic oppression, remoteness from power, misplaced priorities, Vietnam and the draft, materialistic values, and the media. The opinions of students on these issues are accompanied by comments by the author(s) of this report. Various recommendations for non-repressive federal action are offered. (JS)

ED052762

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

(Not printed at Government expense)

United States *of* America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Congress Looks at the Campus:

REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of leading a group of 22 colleagues in a volunteer tour of American campuses. Organizing into six regional groups, we visited over 50 universities of all types and sizes and personally met with over a thousand students, as well as many faculty, administrators, and other concerned adults. Our main purpose was to listen, not to lecture, and we came away with a new insight into student outlooks. One important result was the following written report, which we submitted to President Nixon on June 18.

Because of the publicity it has received in the national press, the high level of interest it has achieved, and the numerous requests we have received from fellow Members, I insert the report following my remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: We submit to you the following report of campus unrest. The critical urgency of the problem cannot be overstated.

This report reflects our impressions of student attitudes and problems, along with some proposed solutions applicable at local, state and national levels. It represents a general consensus of our 22 man group. However, because each of us undertook this task as individuals, we must reserve the right of members to expand upon, or even disagree with, any specific point.

It is our hope that the findings included in this document will be of use to you in your continued efforts at solving what has become a major national problem.

Respectfully yours,

BILL BROCK, EDWARD BIESTER, GEORGE BUSH, LOU FREY, DONALD RIEGLE, BILL STEIGER, JOHN BUCHANAN, LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, MARVIN ESCH, JAMES HASTINGS, LARRY HOGAN, MANUEL LUJAN, DONALD LUKENS, PETE MCCLOSKEY, JACK MCDONALD, JERRY PETTIS, ALBERT QUIE, TOM RAILSBACK, PHIL RUPPE, GUY VANDER JAGT, LOWELL WEICKER, WILLIAM WHITEHURST.

REPORT OF THE BROCK CAMPUS TOUR

PREFACE

A deep concern about today's problem of unrest among our youth, and the realization that we possessed little reliable information about events on the American campus prompted us to go out to a variety of colleges and universities to talk with students, faculty, administrators, and other officials on their own ground. We had nothing to sell, no speeches to make, and offered only a desire to know and understand the factors which appear to threaten the destruction of many of our most respected institutions and the alienation of many of this nation's finest students.

The problems confronting higher education are so complex that no study or analytic effort yet mounted can really claim to be comprehensive. We recognize the need for continued in-depth research. Nonetheless, we believe we achieved substantial success with respect to our main concern—the acquisition of some degree of personal understanding of the nature of the problem.

We came away from our campus tour both alarmed and encouraged. We were alarmed to discover that this problem is far deeper and far more urgent than most realize, and that it goes far beyond the efforts of organized revolutionaries. By the same token, we were encouraged by the candor, sincerity and basic decency of the vast majority of students we met. Too often, however, we saw their idealism and concern vented in aimless or destructive ways.

If one point is to be emphasized in this report it is that violence in any form, in any measure, under any circumstances, is not a legitimate means of protest or mode of expression—and that it can no more be tolerated in the university community than in the community at large. If there is to be orderly progress and a redress of legitimate student grievances, student violence must be averted.

As Erwin N. Griswold, Solicitor General of the United States, has said:

"The right to disagree—and to manifest disagreement—which the Constitution allows to the individual . . . does not authorize them to carry on their compaign of education and persuasion at the expense of somebody else's liberty. . . ."

It is clear that if violence on our campuses does not end, and if the reaction to it is on the one extreme too lax, or on the other extreme too harsh and indiscriminate, the vast moderate student majority may be forced into the arms of the revolutionaries, and those few who seek to destroy the fabric of higher education will have succeeded.

We agree with the editorial in the June 8 *New York Times:*

"If lasting damage to the independence of the universities is to be avoided, if the society's attention is to be redirected to its larger, more serious problems, violence has to cease and tranquility has to be returned to the campuses."

There is on the campus today a new awareness of potential student power and the emergence of a large group, probably the vast majority of student leaders and a substantial number of intelligent, concerned and perplexed young people, which has genuine concern over what it feels is the difference between the promise and performance of America. While these students have no monolithic leadership or single set of goals, they are fairly united in questioning many of the values of our system. The revolutionaries on campus who desire to destroy our system are few in number. The vast majority of students are not poised on the edge of revolution and have not lost faith in our system. However, many students can be radicalized when violence or confrontation on campus occurs. Also disillusionment in our system by students can grow, even without

355-693—17502

HE 002 485

violence, if we place one label on all students and fail to understand that they raise many areas of legitimate concern.

Perhaps our most important and pressing conclusion is that rash legislative action cutting off funds to entire institutions because of the actions of a minority of students would play directly into the hands of these hard-core revolutionaries. Legislation which treats innocent and guilty alike inadvertently confirms extremist charges that the "establishment" is repressive and indifferent to citizen needs and concerns. We must not put ourselves in the position of aiding the handful of anarchists.

In a period of conflict and turmoil, deep divisions on campus as well as between campus and community are understandable, but the danger exists that these divisions are polarizing America into two distinct camps. On neither side has there been enough willingness to listen and discuss problems before the fireworks have begun and emotions have been inflamed. Obviously it is time for our traditional American sense of fair play and tolerance to be evidenced by the responsible majority of this nation, young and old. The alternative of students, intolerant and unwilling to reason, and their elders, intolerant and unwilling to reason, constitutes the ingredients of chaos.

To the extent that our universities can foster an environment of trust, participation, involvement and interaction, we believe that the danger of violent confrontation (and the emotional climate which is its prelude) can be reduced. To the extent that this nation can foster an environment of quality, excitement and challenge throughout its total educational system, creative leadership can be developed. In this report we offer proposals aimed at implementing these goals. We can envision no greater tragedy for this nation and the free world than for us to allow our educational system to slowly settle into obsolescence, losing touch with reality and becoming incapable of responding to the needs of students and society.

We also suggest more positive contact between the campus community and the greater community—increased social action programs, volunteer projects and similar activities which provide students with an opportunity to work on pressing human problems side by side with other concerned citizens.

We are convinced that such experiences can be an important supplement to the classroom, acting to restore student faith in the basic soundness of the American system. Additionally, they can demonstrate in positive fashion the sincere good intentions of a significant portion of the adult community—which many students and faculty with whom we met so readily charged with hypocrisy.

Finally, this nation has an enormous stake in preserving our system of higher education. "The task of the university," as Alfred North Whitehead has written, "is the creation of the future as far as rational thought and civilized modes of appreciation can affect the issue." The creation of a better future will indeed be impossible if the free and orderly pursuit of knowledge is jeopardized by the destruction of our colleges and universities either through anarchy, or through a refusal to consider pleas for necessary improvements.

This report, in listing a series of ideas for consideration, is offered not as a panacea, but, hopefully, as a bridge to greater understanding of the problem.

FACTORS IN UNREST

In an effort to most accurately and clearly represent what students were saying and thinking on the campuses we visited, we have listed below areas of concern as they were described to us by the students themselves. In reporting student views, we are in no way passing judgment, but merely trying to convey a better understanding of what the students feel.

Where we have reached conclusions of our own, they have been specifically noted by indentation and italics, so that there can be no confusing the reportorial and analytical portions of this report.

Internal factors

Communication

On campus after campus we found widespread criticism from students who feel unable to communicate with administrators and faculty. They believe that no adequate channel is open to them to make their views known. Channels which do exist provide only limited access to individuals who will take responsibility for major decisions.

In some cases, the university structure itself seems at fault. In these instances the modern university is so large, and decision-making so fragmented, the student often finds it difficult to identify the individual or organization that has the final responsibility for a particular policy.

Operating within a large bureaucracy, administrators find it easy or necessary to avoid definitive answers to student inquiries; they pass the inquiries to the faculty, the regents, or the legislatures. These agencies in turn seem even more isolated from the student point of view and even less open to communication.

An immense frustration is built when the student feels he once again must go through a channel which is not "plugged into" the policy-making power of the university.

Charges of communication gaps are leveled against faculty, administrators, and governing boards alike. In many instances students charge that the actions of the overseeing bodies, i.e., regents, trustees, etc., are determined by outside business and political influences. Such boards are looked upon as keepers of the status quo who make no attempt to consult with students on any decisions, including those decisions which directly affect the students.

Students, in turn, seem unaware of the factors and pressures that the governing board must consider and endure.

Faculties are criticized for time spent on consulting work for the government or for private industry, and for spending too much time researching and publishing. These activities, however worthwhile, are seen as isolating the faculties from the concerns and problems of the students.

In our view the non-teaching activities of some faculty members, particularly in large universities, are excessive. The "publish or perish" phrase is not simply a cliche. In many areas it implies a valid criticism.

Responsiveness

Claims of inadequate channels of communication frequently were linked with complaints about the lack of responsiveness to student demands.

This situation is aggravated where there is a lack of agreement, or of shared perspective, between administration and faculty. Despite protestations to the contrary, such circumstances are hardly unusual. Faculty and administration often are at odds on everything from the way to reply to student requests to the quality, method, and timing of university response to student protests.

When university action is taken, or problems are at least under serious review, students who are not involved in the step-by-step deliberations fail to understand the amount of planning required and the complexity involved in the solutions they propose to the university.

Since many universities do not seem to be geared to initiate or administer either quick or long lasting change, increasing passion mounts on both sides of an issue with resulting polarization and alienation of more moderate students who may or may not sympathize with some of the basic requests.

The students feel that it is the administration and the faculty who decide which students will be accepted as student spokesmen. Even when some students are in positions of consultation with the university, administration and faculty, a majority of students may deny that actual representation or communication occurs. On one large campus, for example, a list of student leaders drawn up by the Dean of Students and a list prepared by the editor of the student newspaper had no names in common.

We feel that these and similar situations can only lead to a conclusion that a lack of real or visible responsiveness has been an ingredient in campus conflict.

Student Intolerance

Although most students would deny it, and many would be genuinely surprised by the charge, the intolerance of a substantial portion of students is a contributing factor to the general unrest. Often insulated from day-to-day social responsibilities and contact with other age groups, some students seldom have the opportunity to see our society solving problems or meeting human needs. In the course of study and discussion, however, they are continually exposed to society's many real failures and seeming in-

355-693—17502

consistencies. The result for many has been a combination of deep social concern and a disenchantement with traditional institutions and approaches to problems.

Frequently students are strong in framing ideal solutions and weak in analyzing the factors involved in the problem and in its solution. Some demand immediate solutions and failing that, rush into confrontation as the "only altrenative course". They may resort to "non-negotiable demands", a technique that is often cited as evidence of student intolerance.

The more militant students insist on acting as a group, feeling that their hope of success lies in refusing to deal with opponents on an individual basis. Refusal to negotiate may indeed indicate merely a desire to disrupt for the sake of disruption but it may also reflect a lack of understanding and a lack of skill and confidence in the bargaining techniques long vitally employed in of democratic society.

Such intolerance contains dangerous seeds of self-destruction. Unchecked, it can only breed a like degree of intolerance on the part of those who have made higher educational opportunity available to more young Americans than any society in history.

It should also be recognized that some of the intolerance displayed is purposeful and perhaps irreversible. The revolutionary is determined to remain unappeased in the hope of prompting administration reaction of a sufficiently excessive or violent nature to "radicalize" the moderate student majority. He must seek this goal because radicalism as a force to destroy can achieve no objectives, can obtain no real results on our campuses today without the tacit or even open support of far more responsible and moderate students who may be captured by the events of the moment. In order to be "radicalized", these students must have their emotions preconditioned by a situation (or series of situations) which would generate an initial expression of sympathy toward the avowed aims of the revolutionaries.

Hyprocrisy

Students complained that the university, like society, fails to practice what it preaches. They point to teaching and the transmission of learning as the center of a university, and contrast this with faculty efforts to reduce teaching loads in order to have more time for research. Many students accused university administrations of applying a double standard in enforcing regulations. They claimed that students who violated rules as part of a politically motivated or anti-institutional protest were more heavily penalized than those who violated the same rules for other reasons. Replying to the university's often expressed concern for social problems in the community, students point to university expansion into ghetto neighborhoods through programs students call "urban removal."

They charge that academic freedom is a myth when the university's purpose and direction is "subverted" by massive infusion of funds for military and industrial research. In response to the effort to educate the disadvantaged, students charge that too few are admitted and that those admitted find the institution unresponsive to individual needs and problems.

Relevance

Underlying specific issues is a fundamental dispute about the structure of the university and its role in society. A vast gulf exists between the views of faculty and administrators and the views of the students.

It is characterized by the recently published statement of a university student:

"Most of them (the faculty) hold to the ideal that the university is a neutral institution, devoted to objective truth. But the people who have power in America have pervaded this institution. The university could never be neutral in our present society—profit making and war making—I'd be skeptical that the university could assume a neutral posture. The university ought to be a partisan of the progressive forces in society."

This student's view is an obvious departure from the generally held public view of a university as an isolated tower that transmits and enlarges knowledge in the process of preparing individuals for careers. This student opinion requires that the university be relevant to our era and its problems, that it be committed to an active role as a progressive force. What is important about this perspective is that it is expounded not by a minority of revolutionaries but by very large numbers of sincere and highly motivated young people.

For the student, a clear definition of this relevancy is very difficult, since its development is in a formative stage and its meaning changes from area to area. On one hand, for the university to be relevant, it is held that it must cease to uphold traditional "establishment" institutions and systems. In this context, many universities have seen demonstrations against campus recruiting by various corporations involved in defense contracts, against the inclusion of ROTC in the curriculum, and against certain research projects. On the other hand, it is suggested that these ties must be replaced with new commitments to support urban improvement, and the extension of civil rights. Clearly many complaints about specific course requirements are closely related to this concern for the university's relevance. The students ask, "What is a university? What should the relationship be between the university and the surrounding community?" They are asking to what extent higher education should be radically altered to prepare graduates to go into society to change things.

They are asking how much of what they learn is "relevant" to today's society. They would like to see a closer relationship between their courses and the problems they see. They are asking for courses which can provide answers to problems of race, poverty, and economic oppression, and they regard present course offerings as noticeably lacking in this relationship. In one notable instance these demands would be satisfied by nothing less than student control of the curriculum, but large numbers of students who do not make such radical demands are nonetheless asking for a more "relevant" education.

Some students appear to be more caught up in contemporary problems rather than in the difficult process of learning needed to toughen and strengthen their minds to achieve workable solutions to unsolved problems. In these students we found an impatience with and a lack of appreciation of method and process, whether it be the intellectual method of abstraction and generalization or the process of practicing democracy as a value in itself.

Over-reaction

The student voices deep concern about methods used to respond to student confrontations. Many feel that the university has over-reacted with excessive force. They point to incidents involving clubbing and gassing demonstrators and bystanders, as examples of an "oppressive system." On numerous occasions moderate leaders of peaceful demonstrations cited the subsequent inability to prevent individual acts of provocation and violence by radical students, thereby permitting a confrontation to erupt into violence. Likewise, students pointed to numerous instances of over-aggressive reaction by individual law officials which had the effect of radicalizing otherwise passive onlookers, turning a relatively small-scale disturbance into a general battle.[1]

Many individual students pointed to the Dartmouth procedure (a court injunction against the occupation of a building, and the peaceful and quiet arrest of demonstrators) as the best approach.

Lack of combined faculty-administration action aggravates a situation, and in some instances, a slow response due to a reluctance to act created further difficulties. In other instances an immediate resort to excessive force exaggerated the problem.

The student frequently complains of double jeopardy—prosecution by civil authorities and then by the university. He maintains that those who violate a university regulation in the more traditional manner, as a prank, are treated more lightly than those who violate the same rule for a political purpose.

Additional stress is borne by the administrator because of his role of buffer between the faculty and the governing board. He is subject to the direction of both and often the approval of neither.

Blacks at Predominantly Black Institutions

There is a depth of bitterness in even the most moderate of black students at black institutions that surpasses anything found among the whites.

[1] For a more detailed treatment of this process, see the appendix "Dynamics of a Confrontation."

355-693—17502

The black student expresses bitterness about our system from personal experience. Many white students expressed concern about problems such as discrimination, poverty and hunger, but unlike the black students, most of them stated they had not personally experienced these problems. As more than one black student said—"You have to be black to understand."

A substantial number of black students at predominately black institutions stated that they have lost faith in our political system, which over the years has promised them much, but in their opinion, delivered little. They say there "are political wolves in the South and political foxes in the North." Many of the blacks want desperately to believe in the system, but can see no real progress being made. Their problem is more external than internal. They are concerned about non-college problems which they identify as discrimination, economic oppression, loss of identity, poverty, hunger and racism. They ask to be respected and desire true economic opportunity. Words and promises will no longer suffice.

In many cases the militant blacks at predominately black campuses are looking for a dramatic and, if necessary, violent upheaval in the United States. They would acknowledge our good intentions, but felt that the faster and more complete the failure of moderate programs, the sooner the final and absolute confrontation would occur. When asked how they would change the system, or what changes they would make, they didn't have an answer—but said that problem would take care of itself.

The black feels that the white radical is playing a game, and only need shave his beard and cut his hair in order to melt into the mainstream of the establishment, while the black student cannot.

The main goal of the majority of black students seemed to be service to their "black brothers and sisters". Some said that they would rather die for their people in the streets of the United States than in Vietnam.

The black students in most cases stated that their schools are inferior to white institutions, even when operated by the same authority, such as a state board of regents. In many cases, they also stated that, because of their inferior primary and secondary education, they are unable to compete with the white graduate or in predominately white schools. Many black educators and students felt that the H.E.W. guidelines should be revised until our entire educational system is corrected, to allow for the continued existence of predominately black schools. The rationale offered was that the black schools would allow many blacks to attend college who couldn't get, or stay, in white colleges. Further it would allow the blacks to retain their own pride and identity and find themselves, instead of being submerged in predominantly white schools. The black schools would be able to offer many courses and programs in college which would allow the blacks to "catch up" to their white college counterparts who have received a better primary and secondary education.

The educators and students also suggested more programs, based on the Head Start concept, in the high schools or between high school and college to raise the educational level. They emphasized that the programs would work best if blacks were involved at all levels, i.e., they felt only a black could truly understand the problems faced by another black.

Relative to the relaxation of HEW guidelines, we discovered that the black institutions are making a concerted effort to recruit white students and faculty. While they have been moderately successful as far as faculty are concerned, they say it is extremely difficult to convince white students to attend a predominately black institution.

Non-White Student Issues

The primary concern of minority students is to acquire the kind of education they perceive as essential to being able to return to their communities and better the conditions of their people. They want their education to provide the training they need to deal with the problems of minority groups in America, and they see higher education as the best avenue to their personal development.

A particular example of the demand for relevance has been the widespread support for minority studies programs by blacks and other non-white minorities. Most of the activity in this area has taken place on predominately white campuses, and is often discussed within the framework of the problems of minority group students when they find themselves in a basically all-white environment. The students like to compare their position on a campus where they constitute less than two per cent of the student body, to the problems faced by a white student if he were to attend a university where the student body was 98 per cent black. Both faculty and students said that without thorough preparation of internal college processes and organization, increases in non-white admissions can result in the severe disillusionment of non-white students and a backlash among others on campus. They expressed the feeling that the courses offered by the university do not give adequate coverage to blacks and other minorities in American history and in other subjects dealing with the processes of American society. They feel that such courses are cast in terms and events totally foreign to the experience of most black students. It is claimed that an economics course which fails to present "accurate" views of economic conditions of ghetto life is not relevant, and history courses designed for middle class whites are not relevant for blacks.

The minority groups say that much of the difficulty turns on the inadequacies of the public school systems in deprived areas, as well as disadvantages which pervaded their early lives. Failure to respond to these concerns, we were told, would threaten to drive the black activists into the ranks of the revolutionaries.

Demands for Black Studies Departments, minority student centers and the admission of large numbers of minority students who often lack adequate preparation are issues not easily resolved. A number of universities are beginning creatively to make the kinds of adjustments needed. Of special interest are the programs now in operation at a few schools to accept students who do not meet normal requirements for entrance, to provide financial aid, special tutoring and courses, and enrollment in a five year program leading to a degree.

It is important to make a clear distinction between the purposes and goals of black militant students and white revolutionaries. Aside from similarities in tactics, there are substantial differences. Without doubt, the alienation and bitterness among some black students is so great that they have completely lost faith in the ability of the nation to remove obstacles to full equality (see preceding section). Many black student activists on predominantly white campuses, however, appear to be seeking to reform the university, to make it better suited to serve their needs and desires, to create the mechanism for training students from minority groups to go back into their communities to deal with major social and economic problems, and not to destroy the university. This is in contrast to the goal of destroying the institution held by some white and black revolutionaries. Thus black student militants have held the white revolutionaries at arm's length—forming alliances when useful but preserving their separate identity and independence. By the same token, the formal involvement of black student groups in issues not directly related to minority student problems has been, in most cases, limited.

Large Versus Small Institutions

An immediate difference appears in the ability of smaller institutions to deal with some problems more readily and with greater acuity than the multi-university. Size affects responsiveness, communications and many other needs. Meeting them at larger schools is more difficult, but it is not impossible, and the effort must be made.

Obviously, there are very good reasons for the tremendous growth of some institutions in recent years. The population explosion, increasing demand for mass education, university financing, and the national reputation of specific institutions have all resulted in the development of a number of very large schools.

The challenge is to find ways to preserve the benefits of size while overcoming its disadvantages. We must seek ways to strengthen the ability of our universities to provide close personal relationships and the experiences available in small group settings. Greater development of community colleges, and even cluster colleges around the large university, can also play an important part in "rehumanizing" the learning process.

External factors

As with the section on internal factors of student unrest, our main concern is to clearly

355-693—17502

depict what the students themselves told us. All interpretation and analysis by ourselves is included in separate indented, italicized passages.

Students relayed to us deep feelings about "the System", "the Establishment", etc. The word, System, covers a good deal and its components vary from campus to campus. In all we have discerned certain common threads. The System, as they define it, is characterized essentially as follows:

Racism

The student perceives the gulf between the promise and performance of this nation with respect to race relations. He sees inequality of opportunity, failure of the educational system, and he relates these to the country as a whole as well as to the university. For the most part, we found a perceived neglect of human problems to be the single largest motivating force behind the alienation of today's student. Whether in black studies questions, or in the university's relation with its surrounding community, an over-riding concern was the status of minority groups.

Military Industrial Complex

There is considerable student opposition to our formidable Defense budget. Why, they ask, do funds for domestic and educational programs get cut while the Defense budget goes almost unchallenged? They see a close relationship between the academic community and the military. They see university presidents sitting as members of boards of large industrial corporations. They see cuts being made in funds to hire teachers while boards of trustees authorize new buildings and facilities in order to receive greater Federal research funds.

Poverty and Hunger

In this age of affluence the medium of television brings home to people the gap between well-to-do and the poor. There is a growing dissatisfaction on the part of students with the response of the nation to the disadvantaged. They are not willing to wait to overcome decades of poverty and racial intolerance, and they question apparent past inaction. The immediate problems around the college campus often become the focal point for their attention. The failure of many institutions to act with regard for the neighborhood around them has caused the student to take as his own the cause of the Harlem or Woodlawn resident.

Certainly, student involvement in such matters is not new: witness the civil rights marches of the early 1960's. What is new is the intense impatience with change or the apparent lack of change in the lives of many Americans.

Imperialism and the Third World

On a number of campuses a recurring question related to the role of the United States and the problems of what is termed the "Third World" (blacks, Chinese, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans, etc.). The view expressed was that we are the imperialists in Vietnam, in Formosa, in Latin America, and that the emerging nations are a new force with whom we have not yet come to grips. Some feel we are not treating other people in the world fairly, and from the view of the student, we are paying the price of not heeding the views and needs of others. In their view, self-determination, as expressed by the United States, is a pious proclamation which relates only to those with whom we agree.

Police State

The experience of one school more clearly demonstrates this problem than any other. When the students left in the summer of 1968 the campus police wore no weapons. When the students returned in the Fall of 1968 the campus police were equipped with billy clubs, guns, and mace. For a school that had experienced no difficulty, the students questioned why this was done. As violence grows, and as counter-violence escalates, the student views his relationship with both the university and the outside world as increasingly beset by the police and National Guard. Each demonstration brings with it the threat of violence on both sides.

Economic Oppression

The readiness of legislatures and alumni to strike back at campus turbulence seems only to reinforce the student's view that big government and big industry more and more dominate the university and society. What has happened at Peoples Park in Berkeley, on Mifflin Street in Madison, and other places, are examples of a new concern for matters outside the university, yet, in which the university plays a role. Student housing, the increases in rent rates, merchants who charge higher prices to students (as they do to ghetto residents) are examples used by students to justify their claims of oppression.

Remoteness From Power

A very large part of the alienation of students stems from their feeling that they cannot control their own destiny. Institutions are too large, and too remote for the individual to have an opportunity to change that which he does not like. The multiversity concept is often pointed to here, as is the overwhelming size of government, industry, and labor unions.

Misplaced Priorities

Over and over again we heard about priorities and the feeling that these are "out of whack" in the United States. The space program, large farm subsidies, cuts in education, the Defense budget, and more, all were cited as examples of the failure of our society to meet its urgent domestic needs.

Vietnam

It is apparent that Vietnam originally served as one of the major factors in radicalizing students. It is still a major source of alienation and dissatisfaction with our society and our national government. Many consider the war immoral and unjust. An increasing number vow to take any steps necessary to avoid military service.

However, it was repeatedly brought home to us by radicals and moderates alike that an end to the Vietnam war would not mean an end to campus unrest—or even a major, long-range, reduction of tensions.

The Draft

Coupled with Vietnam the operations of the Selective Service System serve as a significant problem among students. The present administration of the draft is viewed as totally unsatisfactory, as being unjust to minority groups particularly, and as a tool of the Federal Government to enforce discipline. Faculty and students alike tend to equate expulsion from the university with compulsory service in Vietnam.

Values: Materialism

As one student put it, "This is a 'thing' culture, and I want it to be a 'people' culture." In the midst of affluence the students see a society in which a high value is placed on material things. There is a longing for a belief, a belief in something other than material things. There is a deep conviction on the part of many students that they want to do something to help others, not only themselves. This is part of a rejection of materialism as viewed by the student. Moreover, there is a questioning of the fundamental values of our society, and our system of government.

Over-reaction

As can be seen from the portion of this report which analyzes confrontation, the efforts to control violence—as well as those steps leading to violence—too often create an over-reaction on the part of all concerned. In our view there has been an over-reaction on the part of students to what they consider to be the unresponsiveness of the institutions to legitimate calls for change.

This compounds what under the best of circumstances is a complex problem. But an excessive reaction from the outside world, aroused and disturbed as it is, does little to help. In a violent situation, students, faculty, administration and the community, are caught in a tangled web of sympathy, fear, reaction and frustration. Obviously then, as the Eisenhower Commission on Violence has said in its most recent report: "Over reaction in response to a violent illegal situation can be very dangerous."

The idea that campus violence comes from only a few is a myth. There are many dedicated, bright students who are concerned about the problems but who are not yet violent. They have not, however, rejected completely the view that they should resort to violence. Unfortunately, they can point to some campuses where violence has produced results.

Hypocrisy

Through all the external and internal factors runs this thread. Each campus would produce differing examples of this theme, but it is an underlying feeling on the part of the students.

Students believe that our society is hypocritical. They point to the treatment of blacks while contrasting this to the ideal of the Declaration of Independence; they see poverty in the midst of plenty.

355-693—17502

The Media

Most of the people we talked with stated the opinion that superficial mass media coverage was contributing to the widening disillusionment and misunderstanding between the public and the nation's campuses. The media, particularly that utilizing the visual impression, concentrates on the dramatic, the sensational, the vivid acts of violence or disorder.

There is altogether too little effort made to thoughtfully explore the underlying issues and problems that concern the vast majority of students and educators who genuinely want to change things for the better. Not only does this distorted coverage inflame the worst fears and stereotypes in the public mind, but it adds to the frustrations of those trying to work for progress and constructive change on campus.

We believe the media can and must become a more powerful forum for bridging the "perception and understanding" gap between the public and our universities.

The very nature of modern communications—visual, instantaneous—plays a role both in determining the tactics of demonstrators and in shaping public opinion about events on a campus. The public focuses on disorders, and these have occurred with sufficient frequency to leave the impression that little else is taking place in higher education.

The point to be made is that the media can offer a mechanism by which misconceptions can be corrected. Although some publications and broadcasting networks have devoted substantial time and effort to excellent indepth studies of the factors discussed in this report, more is required if understanding is to be created.

IDEAS FOR CONSIDERATION

As we learned, there is no single answer, nor any set of answers, to the problems faced by students or our society. The internal and external factors which we have tried to catalogue here lead us, nevertheless, to suggest for your consideration, Mr. President, a series of ideas which we believe merit urgent consideration.

1. No repressive legislation. Any action by the Congress or others which would, for example, penalize innocent and guilty alike by cutting off all aid to any institution which has experienced difficulty would only serve to confirm the cry of the revolutionaries and compound the problem for each university. This holds, also, for any action which would establish mediation or conciliation on the part of the Federal government. In our opinion, the fundamental responsibility for order and conduct on the campus lies with the university community.

2. Establish a Commission on Higher Education. In light of our findings we believe that a Presidential Commission on Higher Education would be a valuable step. Running through our report are examples of problems which students, faculty, and administrators have raised and which deserve further exploration. What is the role of the Federal government in research? What has this contributed to creating priorities within the university? How best can communication be opened and maintained? How well does this report reflect the reality of the American college scene? These and more would be appropriate questions for such a Commission which we believe should include a thoroughly representative selection of students, faculty, and administrators together with the general public. We do not foresee an investigative body but rather one which can help to create understanding among members of the academic community, as well as the general public.

3. Open communication to university community. We have found that many were surprised by our visit and by our willingness to listen and learn. There is a need to expand lines of communication. We urge that Cabinet officers, Members of Congress, the White House staff, and others in the Executive Branch begin an increasing effort for this kind of two-way street of listening, learning and responding. Once our communication has become established it will be important to sustain it. Some of the questions raised by students were truly the kind which deserve and demand answers. Some of the viewpoints expressed by students deserve understanding. And some of the misconceptions of the system of government within which we operate desperately need correction. This can best be done, we believe, through an ongoing program of communication.

4. Lower the voting age. There is no question that the American college student for the most part is better educated and more vially concerned wih contemporary problems in our country than at any previous time in our history. We feel that active involvement in the political process can constructively focus his idealism on the most effective means of change in a free society.

The right to vote will give Young America the chance to become a responsible, participating part of our system. In essence they will have the chance to put their performance where their words are.

Between the time they become eligible for the draft, and the time they presently become eligible to vote, there is a natural tendency to lose interest in politics and government because there is no right to participate. An extension of the franchise to the age of 18 when their interest is high can help engender in our youth (and our future leadership) an awareness of the full meaning of democracy.

5. Draft reform. In line with your own recommendations for reform of the Selective Service System, we believe Congress should move to act promptly on this important issue. It is a matter which affects hundreds of thousands of American young people and it is presently a sword over their heads. This can be improved and positive action on the matter would be significant.

6. Encourage student participation in politics. We found that the overwhelming majority of students with whom we visited hold little regard for either political party. The questioning of our system of government points to a loss of confidence in established institutions and that includes political parties. An increase in this loss of confidence poses a serious danger to the viable functioning of American government. Just as government must be responsive, so must political parties be responsive and open.

7. Expand opportunities for involvement. We found an encouraging desire on the part of many students to do something to help overcome the problems of our society. This dedication or commitment to help others is a hopeful, important area which should be encouraged. Specifically, we recommend establishing a *National Youth Foundation*. We believe this concept should be initiated in order to better utilize the energy and resources of student groups. Models of student-community involvement were found at the University of South Carolina, Radcliff and Michigan State University, among others, and we urge legislation to foster and encourage this opportunity for experience, learning and participation.

We also recommend establishing a *Student Teacher Corps*. Many more students are considering entering the teaching profession and this idea is one which we feel should be encouraged. In concert with the Teacher Corps, the student teacher concept can be a valuable tool to tap student potential and expand the learning opportunities for the disadvantaged.

Further, we recommend *increasing our support of the College Work-Study Program, National Defense Student Loan Program, and the Educational Opportunity Grant Program*. These three Federal programs would be beneficial in meeting the needs of students and the institutions in responding to student concerns. They are budgeted at levels far below the authorization, and we believe they should be increased.

From the community at large, American business, which has played such a large role in financially supporting higher education, must commit human resources as well. Expanded job-opportunity programs, work-studies programs, business men and other community leaders teaching on campus, intern and apprentice efforts, leadership in student-community problem solving, attendance at campus forums, among others, could measurably enhance the experience-learning process.

8. Coordinate youth programs. We think it would be helpful if an effort were made to coordinate all the present youth programs of the Federal government through one central office. At the moment there is considerable proliferation among many agencies as well as duplication of effort. In order to more effectively use the present resources of the Federal government we urge your consideration of a mechanism to coordinate and follow-through the work of our numerous programs and agencies.

9. Perspective. There is a need to mobilize opinion and resources. A sense of perspective is lacking on the part of the students and on the part of the public. What students are

355-693—17502

saying is, in some cases, the same as what the average American is saying regarding priorities, responsiveness, and humanization. Presidential leadership, governmental concern, and communication are all a part of the necessary work which must be undertaken if we are to replace revolution with reform, and despair with hope. Clearly we have found that violence is no answer, and that violence as a means to achieve an end is counter-productive. The crucial factor in the widening gap between students and others is the student's perception of reality. That must be understood by all who seek solutions. This requires of us comprehension, and of the student, understanding.

10. Balance. Henry Thoreau observed that, "There are a thousand hacking at the branches of evil to one who is striking at the root."

To take an isolated view of our universities as the one weak link in our educational system is to unfairly single out college students, their parents, professors and school administrators.

We must remember that the average college freshman has already undergone a dozen years of formal education before he enters the gates of the university. Obviously, he is going to reflect, at least in some measure, the strengths and weaknesses of the training he has already received. Many of his attitudes and many of the factors which may lead him into difficulties on campus, have already been implanted.

Therefore, a sweeping change in campus conditions alone is no guarantee of a return to orderly progress in our universities. There exist imperfections in our educational system from pre-school programs to graduate studies. These flaws in American education deserve the immediate and thorough attention of the nation. The problems which have already surfaced on the college campus exist in various dormant forms in our secondary schools, and the inadequacies which foster them can often be traced back even further. Until consistent, challenging, quality education becomes a reality, the problem will remain.

APPENDIX

Dynamics of Confrontation

Every stage of college confrontation—"before", "during" and "after"—is represented among the Task Force visits, including:

Tranquil campuses: With no history of, and little likelihood of, disruption.

Uneasy campuses: With some of the ingredients of discontent.

Troubled campuses: With various forms of group civil disobedience, e.g. sit-ins, protest rallies, occupation of buildings.

Paralyzed campuses: With civil war and open military siege.

Convalescent campuses: With diverse groups struggling to heal the wounds of confrontation and resolve differences. But the seeds of instability remain and there are conflicting opinions as to whether real progress or continuing instability will result.

Although schools vary widely in region, size, student body profile, structure, governance, and campus issues, there does emerge a common and almost predictable pattern of escalating circumstances through which a university can slide from dissent to open confrontation and chaos. This progressive breakdown is by no means inexorable on every campus, since only a few hundred of the nation's 2500 colleges have experienced disruption.

On many campuses a good mix of conditions, plus cooperation among students, faculty, and administration continues to make it possible to resolve differences without open confrontation and to make progress as a community. These influences toward rational progress are mentioned elsewhere in the report.

The temptation to oversimplify cause and effect relationships should be resisted—keeping in mind that some schools with much trouble have been working hardest, albeit unsuccessfully, to develop progressive change and self-governance.

However, the frequency of confrontation has increased at such an alarming rate over the last year, that it is well to look at the negative conditions which seem to accompany crisis. Once the dynamics of this process start to spiral ahead, the forward momentum and the fragility of any equilibrium lead to an almost inevitable escalation of risk, danger, and lack of coordinated civilized control over events.

Anatomy of conflict

1. The underlying malaise and frustration with both societal and personal issues—coupled with the existence of hardened revolutionaries among students and their sympathizers or even counterparts among the faculty.

2. Identification of an emotional issue which has broader appeal to the target group—non-violent moderates. The issue may be local and narrowly defined, e.g. minority studies, student participation, education reforms—or it may be broader and more symbolic, e.g. the "people's park," military involvement like ROTC or research, reaction to police or military force.

3. In most cases, confrontation comes only after frequent requests for change have failed or gotten bogged down. These attempts may cover several months during which there appears to be little or no action or responsiveness other than perhaps talk or committee wheel spinning. These complaints and/or demands may be legitimate, or they may be a deliberately escalating sequence designed to force confrontation. The reasons for slow action become less important than the absence of results—even though, ironically, the problems are sometimes not within the complete control of the immediate university community. Occasionally, militant radicals may seek violence and confrontation immediately, though this often fails from lack of moderate student support.

4. During this period, faculty and administration are unable to coalesce around initiation of prompt change. This usually results in increased polarization and alienation of more moderate students who sympathize with some of the basic ideas for change.

5. At some time, often almost spontaneously, there is a student-initiated provocation or minor confrontation, which might take the form of a sit-in or rally. Sometimes, incidents such as rock-throwing, yelling obscenities and destruction of property occur. Lack of good, clear, timely communications among faculty, students, and administration begins to exacerbate the crisis. Misinformation becomes more common than good information.

6. This provocation is then often met by excessive and/or indiscriminate rebuff, including the use of out-dated and unenforceable disciplinary procedures or even police in large numbers, weapons, etc. At this point, the moderates, carefully preconditioned to a general feeling of sympathy by events, by fellow students of a more radical orientation, and even by some faculty, and motivated by their lack of confidence and respect for the establishment, as well as by the immediate violation of "their community", join the fray in ever-increasing numbers. It is not difficult to imagine the recruits gained from witnessing a clubbing, tear-gassing, or firing of riot guns. Such an overwhelming situation can readily give the revolutionary cause legitimacy in the eyes of thousands of campus moderates. Thus, it accelerates the process of "radicalizing" a major portion of the student body. In most cases this change is irreversable once made. By this time, the original issue has given way to far broader symbolic implications—and the original core of radicals, whether SDS or some other, have been swept aside by the tide of events. No matter—they have achieved their objective.

7. Positions of all parties become hardened, alternatives narrow as everyone stands on "principle", and virtually no one has full control over events. Finally, because of the excesses on both sides, there usually ensues a period of negotiations where all sides respond to pressures and some sort of compromise is worked out—but only because the pressures are so intense.

8. Relative calm returns, but left behind is an atmosphere of latent crisis. Student attitudes are more embittered and there may be a polarization among faculty, administrators, and most certainly, the surrounding public. To many, there is a general verification of the principle that only the strategy and tactics of confrontation can produce meaningful change, at least in the short run. Others sometimes see a few seeds of progress along with continuing, and perhaps more serious problems.

355-693—17502